

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

COREY BLOCKER,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF MICHIGAN, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

CASE NO. 1:20-CV-444

HON. ROBERT J. JONKER

**ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Green’s Report and Recommendation in this matter (ECF No. 6) and Plaintiff’s Objections (ECF Nos. 8, 10).<sup>1</sup> Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, where, as here, a party has objected to portions of a Report and Recommendation, “[t]he district judge . . . has a duty to reject the magistrate judge’s recommendation unless, on de novo reconsideration, he or she finds it justified.” 12 WRIGHT, MILLER, & MARCUS, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE, § 3070.2, at 451 (3d ed. 2014). Specifically, the Rules provide that:

The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). De novo review in these circumstances requires at least a review of the evidence before the Magistrate Judge. *Hill v. Duriron Co.*, 656 F.2d 1208, 1215 (6th Cir. 1981). The Court has reviewed de novo the claims and evidence presented to the Magistrate Judge; the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court construes the filings Plaintiff entitled “Notice of Appeal to District Judge” (ECF Nos. 8, 10) as Objections to the Report and Recommendation.

Report and Recommendation itself; and Plaintiff's objections. The Court finds the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, which recommends dismissing Plaintiff's complaint, entirely sound.

The Magistrate Judge carefully and thoroughly considered Plaintiff's claims. The Magistrate Judge determined that most of Plaintiff's complaint amounts to a generalized grievance, and that to the extent isolated portions assert an injury-in-fact, Plaintiff has failed to state a claim on which relief may be granted. The Court agrees. In his Objections, Plaintiff primarily reiterates and expands his general grievances. Plaintiff expresses disagreement with the Magistrate Judge but fails to address the Report and Recommendation in any persuasive way. Nothing in Plaintiff's Objections changes the fundamental analysis. After de novo review, this Court determines that dismissal is appropriate, for precisely the reasons detailed in the Report and Recommendation.

**ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED:**

1. The Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 6) is approved and adopted as the opinion of the Court.
2. Plaintiff's Objections (ECF Nos. 8, 10) are **OVERRULED**.
3. Plaintiff's new application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in District Court (ECF No. 9); Motion for Order naming co-defendant (ECF No. 11); and Motion for Default Judgment (ECF No. 12) are **DENIED AS MOOT**.
4. Plaintiff's Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

This case is **CLOSED**.

Dated: July 6, 2020

/s/ Robert J. Jonker  
ROBERT J. JONKER  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE